IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA SPARTANBURG DIVISION

Cornelius J. Farr,)
Plaintiff,) C.A. No. 7:09-2919-HMH-JRM
VS.	OPINION & ORDER
Motor Vehicles Department, DMV of Union County,)
•)
Defendant.)

This matter is before the court with the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Joseph R. McCrorey, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (2006) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 of the District of South Carolina. Cornelius J. Farr ("Farr"), proceeding pro se, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging various violations of his civil rights. In his Report and Recommendation, Magistrate Judge McCrorey recommends summarily dismissing Farr's complaint.

Farr filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. Objections to the Report and Recommendation must be specific. Failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of a party's right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the district judge. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir.

¹ The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

1984). In the absence of <u>specific</u> objections to the Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. <u>See Camby v. Davis</u>, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Upon review, the court finds that many of Farr's objections are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, or merely restate his claims. Based on the foregoing, after a thorough review of the magistrate judge's Report and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge McCrorey's Report and Recommendation.

Therefore, it is

ORDERED that Farr's complaint, docket number 1, is summarily dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr. Senior United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina December 17, 2009

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.